

Application No. 10/055,798 (Tarnoff) Art Unit 2167 Amendment Bpage 6 of 9**REMARKS****Office Communication mailed 2005 June 9**

Claims 16-34 were rejected in the Office Action of June 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, including claims 16, 28 and 30 for which the Office Action indicates that it considers the limitation “said network nodes obtain notifications in a timely and organized manner” indefinite.

Claims 16-19, 21-23, 27, 28 and 30 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by **Chow et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,029,175).

Claims 20, 24-26, 29, 31-34 were rejected in the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over **Chow et al.** as applied to claims 16-19, 21-23, 27, 28 and 30, and further in view of **Umbreit** (U.S. Patent 6,704,787).

Statement of Substance of 2005 Aug 25 Telephone Interview

A telephone interview was conducted by Applicant with the Patent Examiner on 2005 August 25. The topics of the interview were the rejections indicated by the Office Action.

Upon a comparison of the claimed invention to the cited prior art, it was noted by both the Applicant and the Examiner that the claimed invention operates differently and advantageously over the cited prior art, particularly **Chow et al.**, whereby the claimed invention detects website content changes immediately instead of by a slower conventional “polling method.” It was mutually agreed that providing a limitation that included this detection method could make the claimed invention distinguish over the cited prior art.

Applicant is in receipt of Examiner’s Interview Summary (PTOL-413), agrees with its remarks, and notes that it is in agreement with the above point which he addresses in this Amendment.

Also, in discussing the limitation “said network nodes obtain notifications in a timely and organized manner,” it was noted by the Examiner that the limitation should be based more on how the claimed invention operates instead of how the invention influences to what it communicates. The Applicant agreed and correspondingly addresses this limitation in this Amendment.

Application No. 10/055,798 (Tarnoff) Art Unit 2167 Amendment Bpage 7 of 9**Applicant Amends Claims 16-34**

Applicant has amended claims 16, 28 and 30 based on the above documented interview to distinguish them over the cited prior art. To the first means, the limitation "immediately" was added to include the use of active logic by the intelligent agent to intercept events and update to files (Paragraphs 21, 32, 40 and 194).

To the third means, the limitation "notifying said network nodes about said events" has been changed to "transmitting to said network nodes notifications about said events" to incorporate the applicable limitations of the fourth means, itself now deleted to eliminate the § 112 rejection regarding the limitation "said network nodes obtain notifications in a timely and organized manner" (Office Action Items 9-10).

The limitation phrase "said events" has been replaced by "said one or more events" to make it compatible with its antecedent "of one or more events."

Applicant submits that Claim 16 as amended distinguishes over the prior art and is in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-24 are dependent claims to claim 16, and Applicant submits that they are also in condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended independent claims 28 and 30 in the same manner as that for claim 16, and Applicant submits that they are in condition for allowance.

Claims 29 is a dependent claim to claim 28 and claims 31 is a dependent claim to claim 30, and Applicant submits that they are also in condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended claims 25 and 32 to eliminate the § 112 rejection regarding the limitation "oriented towards e-commerce" (Office Action Item 11). The specification of the present invention describes its use in e-commerce applications (Paragraphs 16-17, 20, 32, 42, 173-182 and Figures 16-17). Because the specification clearly discloses how the present invention is used in e-commerce applications and because the objections under § 103 on Umbreit were overcome in Applicant's

Application No. 10/055,798 (Tarnoff) Art Unit 2167 Amendment Bpage 8 of 9

previous office action response dated 2005 Apr 05, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

Applicant has amended claims 26 and 33 to eliminate the § 112 rejection regarding the limitation "oriented towards digital rights management" (Office Action Item 12). The specification of the present invention describes its use in digital rights management applications (Paragraphs 11, 17, 20, 32, 42-46, 225-233 and Figures 16-17). Because the specification clearly discloses how the present invention is used in digital rights management applications and because the objections under § 103 on Umbreit were overcome in Applicant's previous office action response dated 2005 Apr 05, Applicant submits that these claims are in condition for allowance.

New claims 35-39 are in condition for allowance

To further distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art, new claims 35-40 are submitted to be patentable over the art of record for the following reasons:

- 1) All new claims are dependent on claims now in condition for allowance;
- 2) The limitations of these claims are disclosed in the invention's specification:
 - a. Support for the limitations "one or more events relate to content access" in claim 35 and "one or more event related to content change" in claim 36 is found in Paragraphs 149-155 and Figures 9-11.
 - b. Support for the limitations in claims 37-39 is found in Paragraphs 25, 35, 42-43, 149, 188, 237 and Figures 5, 7, 9 (Ref. 213).

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the claims are in proper form, and, since the claims as modified and the new claims define novel structure that produces new and unexpected results as described above, Applicant also submits that these claims are clearly patentable. Therefore, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Application No. 10/055,798 (Tarnoff) Art Unit 2167 Amendment B

page 9 of 9

Pro Se

In view of the fact that the individual inventor of this invention is 100% owner of the rights, title and interest in the invention, he wishes to continue to prosecute any amendments to the application Pro Se. Applicant has amended the claims of this application and submits that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure distinguished above the prior art which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, this application is not found to be in full compliance with the applicable regulations, the applicant respectfully requests constructive assistance from the examiner in correcting any such shortcomings.

Very respectfully,



Harry L. Tarnoff

September 8th, 2005*Applicant Pro Se*

4025 Oakfield Drive

Sherman Oaks

CA 91423

I am available at the following numbers:

Tel: (818) 788-2220; Fax: (818) 788-2252

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission. I certify that on the date below I will fax this paper to Art Unit 2167 of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 571-273-8300.

2005 Sept 08

